DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 293 FL 027 123

AUTHOR Gunarwan, Asim
TITLE The Indonesian Speech Act of Prohibiting among Five Age Groups of Javanese: Evidence of Cultural Transformation?
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Sociolinguistics Symposium (Bristol, England, United Kingdom, April 27-29, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; *Cultural Influences; Foreign Countries; *Interpersonal Communication; *Javanese; *Social Values; *Speech Acts; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Indonesia (Java); *Politeness

ABSTRACT

This study examined how the speech act of prohibiting is realized in terms of directness and indirectness among native Javanese speakers, noting strategies used in socially differentiated speech events and investigating whether the cultural norm of Javanese people, which is renowned for prioritizing politeness, is transforming. Prohibiting was chosen for study because it is a speech act with a high potential to threaten the face of the listener. Surveys completed by 158 native Javanese speakers asked about demographics and Javanese fluency. Respondents provided an act of prohibiting to a hypothetical interlocutor in each of eight hypothetical situations differentiated according to power, solidarity, and public. The hypothetical situations occurred in an air conditioned room in which someone was smoking or about to smoke. Respondents had to imagine having to ask the other person to refrain from smoking, and if they did ask, to write down the token of their prohibition in Indonesian. They also rated the relative degree of the appropriateness of five strategies for prohibiting for each situation. Overall, there was weak indication that the Javanese norms of speaking were changing. Younger Javanese tended to be more straightforward than older Javanese in expressing a directive of prohibiting. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Asim Gunarwan

THE INDONESIAN SPEECH ACT OF PROHIBITING AMONG FIVE AGE GROUPS OF JAVANESE: EVIDENCE OF CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Asim Gunarwan
University of Indonesia

ED 461 293

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the results of a preliminary linguistic-pragmatic study conducted with a view towards finding out how the speech act of prohibiting is realised (in terms of directness and indirectness) among native speakers of Javanese and, by extension, what strategies are used by them in socially differentiated speech events. More importantly, the study aims at seeking some clues whether the cultural norm of the Javanese ethnic group, who is renowned for putting politeness at the top of the scale, is undergoing transformation. The line of thinking behind the norm-transformation hypothesis is that if it were true, it would show in the realisation of speech acts *vis-à-vis* age groups.

The rationale for choosing the speech act of prohibiting for this research study was that it is one of those speech acts which have a high potential of threatening the face (of the hearer). Since face saving is considered an art in itself among Javanese people, it would be interesting to see (1) how they express this highly threatening speech act, and (2) whether, as alluded to above, the realisation of this act covaries with age brackets. There are two reasons for choosing the Javanese speech community as the object of the research study. First, this speech community is renowned for indirection in their linguistic behaviour, especially when it comes to communicating unfavourable things. Second, Javanese are generally also known, at least by other ethnic groups in Indonesia, to have a penchant for avoiding excessiveness as evident, for example, from a common saying *Ngono ya ngono, nanging mbok aja ngono* ('It may be correct to do that, but one should not have resorted to such an excessive act'), which they often cite when commenting on an act performed in immoderation.

On the basis of the foregoing reasons it is only natural to expect that Javanese prohibitions are, in all probability, mostly indirect. Yet, it would still be of some interest to find out to what extent this is true and whether the strategies for expressing this speech act correspond to Brown and Levinson's (1987) five strategies. It would also be of some relevance to find out whether there are signs of change in the degree of indirection of prohibitions along the age dimension, perhaps as a result or a reflection of the shift in social values.

2. Some Javanese Values

According to H. Geertz (1961), quoted by Magnis-Suseno (1985: 38), there are two basic rules which are most determinant in shaping the patterns of social intercourse in the Javanese community. The two basic rules, which Magnis-Suseno calls principles, are the principle of *kerukunan* (harmony) and that of *hormat* (respect). The former refers to the duty of each and every member of the community to endavour to maintain social harmony and the latter refers to the

---

Paper presented at the Sociolinguistics Symposium 2000, University of the West of England, Bristol, 27-29 April 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

responsibility of all community members to show respect to others on every occasion in accordance with their status and standing in the community.

There is a different way of looking at the two principles, however. That is, it would not be incorrect to regard the principle of respect (or *kurmat* in Javanese) as being a corollary of the principle of harmony, the argument being that showing no respect can be interpreted as disrupting an equilibrium which is the social harmony. Subject to verification, it is posited here that there is a cardinal principle which governs all patterns of Javanese social conducts and that this cardinal principle (i.e. the principle of harmony) translates into a number of maxims, four of which are the maxims of *kurmat* (respect), *andhap-asor* (modesty), *empan-papan* (place or position conciousness) and *tepa-slira* (empathy) (Gunarwan, 1996a, b).

The word *rukun* in the posited cardinal principle means 'harmonious' or 'good and peaceful' and is used to refer to a situation or instance in which there is no conflict. Additionally, many instances can be cited to show that Javanese people adhere, or at least try to adhere, to the principle of *rukun* (harmony). Small children at play are advised to be *rukun*, not to quarrel (among Javanese, children are considered *durung Jawa* ('not yet Javanese') and are therefore often reminded to be *rukun*). Sermons after a Javanese wedding almost always mention the importance of living in a *rukun* way for husbands and wives. Often a saying *'Rukun agawe santosa, crah agawe bubrah'* ('Harmony will lead to strength, conflicts will lead to havoc') is cited and a wish *'Dadia kaken inen-inen, rukun kaya mimi lan mituna'* ('May both of you become a great grandfather and a great grandmother, remaining *rukun* like a pair of *mimi* and *mituna* fish') is said.

That people are encouraged to always adhere to this principle seems to be evident from the frequent use of the word *rukun* to refer to an organisation, perhaps in the hope that the members will work harmoniously. Thus, there is an organisation for farmers called *rukun tani*, for women *rukun wanita*, and for families living in the same neighbourhood *rukun tetangga*. People are frequently reminded of the pay-offs of being *rukun*, as implied for instance in the saying above. The pay-off can be very simple and materialistic, as mentioned in the rhyme line often sung in the performances of East Javanese folk theater *'Eman-eman, janji rukun gak kurang pangan'* ('Dearest one, as long as we are *rukun*, there will be no lack of food').

As alluded to above, the first maxim, the maxim of *kurmat* (respect), means that one should show respect to others. In terms of linguistic behaviour, this maxim means 'use language in such a way that the hearer knows that you respect him as he deserves to'. The submaxims would include: (1) do not use language to the effect that the hearer's face would be threatened and (2) choose a speech level (and use honorifics when necessary) in accordance with the hearer's status and standing.

The phrase *andhap-asor* in the second maxim proposed above comes from the word *andhap* ('low') and *asor* ('lowly'). Thus, this maxim can be paraphrased to read something like 'behave as humbly or as modestly as possible.' In terms of linguistic behaviour, it translates into 'use language in such a way that the hearer knows that you are modest (for modesty is a good virtue).' The submaxims would include: (1) maximise praise of others and minimise dispraise of others) (cf. Leech, 1982), and (2) avoid using honorifics for oneself. As with the maxim of respect, the violation of this maxim can disrupt harmony: not to be modest is 'to get on one's high horse' and this may lead to self-praise which in turn can cause others to feel irritated or angry, thus disrupting social harmony.

The word *empan* in the phrase *empan-papan* in the third proposed maxim, the maxim of place consciousness, is derived from the second constituent of the phrase, i.e. *papan*. This word means 'place' or 'position' and thus *empan-papan* means 'be aware of your place or position (in the social constellation where you are a member).' From the viewpoint of the traditional Javanese belief, a person's place in the universe is predetermined and fixed. As long as one is in his assigned place, the equilibrium is maintained. If one changes places, chances are that he will bump into someone else and, again, harmony may be upset.

On a smaller scale, this maxim can also be interpreted to mean 'know where you are (in relation to existent settings).' A form of behaviour may be appropriate in one situation, but it may not be so in another. An utterance, by the same token, may be appropriate and acceptable in one setting, but may sound inappropriate, and even rude, in another.

When it comes to the use of language, thus, this maxim may read as 'use language in accordance with your place in the social ladder of the community and in accordance with the current situation.' The submaxims would be: (1) choose a speech level in accordance with your social status in relation to the hearer's and (2) structure your utterance and select your words by first considering factors such as who the addressee is, what your relationship with him is like, where the interaction takes place, what the interaction is for, ...

The phrase *tepa-slira* in the fourth proposed maxim, the maxim of empathy, consists of the word *tepa*, which is a variant of the word *tepak* ('hit the mark'), and *slira* ('body' or, in this context, 'one's own body'). Thus, this maxim can be paraphrased to read 'don't do unto others as you don't want others to do unto you.' When it comes to the use of language, this maxim may read as 'don't use inappropriate language (in terms of structure and lexicon) to others as you don't want others to use inappropriate language to you.' The submaxims would be: (1) use appropriate language as you want other people to use appropriate language to you and (2) don't use inappropriate language as you don't want other people to use inappropriate language to you.'

A question may arise at this juncture, namely whether all Javanese people always observe all of those maxims (assuming the four maxims are indeed correct) in real communications. The answer is obvious: no. Just as people more often than not violate Gricean maxims, we cannot expect all Javanese to abide by all of the four maxims above all the time. Perhaps only the Javanese Model Person, by analogy of Brown and Levinson's (1987) Model Person, adheres to all of the maxims, letter perfect. Hence, it would be interesting to find out how (and why) Javanese violate the maxims.

3. The Study

3.1 *Theoretical Frameworks*

3.1.1 Speech Act Strategies

The realisation of speech acts can be seen as the application of social rules (cf. Leech, 1982) or as the result of choosing strategies in communication (cf. Brown and Levinson, 1987). In this paper, the realisation of speech acts, including the speech act of prohibiting, is seen as the result of selecting strategies in consideration of social maxims.

The social maxims are the ones posited above and the strategies are posited after Brown and Levinson (1987), who hypothesise that certain acts are in some way face-threatening to either

the speaker or the hearer. According to Brown and Levinson, speakers "calculate" the level of the threat of a speech act by considering the social distance between the parties concerned, the degree of power that one party may have over the other, and the absolute ranking of impositions in a particular culture. On the basis of the result of the "calculation," speakers then choose a strategy for performing the act. Very threatening acts may not be performed at all, and minimally threatening acts may be done in a direct or explicit manner or, to borrow Brown and Levinson's term, "bald on record." In between, speakers can select, depending on the degree of the threat involved, any one of three possible strategies, namely on record with positive politeness, on record with negative politeness, and off record -- in descending order.

For the strategy of on record plus positive politeness redress, Brown and Levinson list fifteen possible ways of performing acts (1987: 102). These include: attending to H (the hearer) (i.e. his interests, wants, needs, goods); exaggerating approval; sympathy with H; intensifying interest to H; seeking agreement; avoiding disagreement; asserting common ground; joking; and giving reasons. For the strategy of on record plus negative politeness, Brown and Levinson list ten possible ways of doing the acts (p. 131). These include: being conventionally indirect; using questions and/or hedges; being pessimistic; giving deference; apologising; and going on record as incurring a debt.

3.1.2 Mental Programming

The point of departure of this research study is the basic assumption that a social system exists because human behaviour is not random: to some degree, it can be predicted. That human behaviour is not random can be explicated by assuming that the human brains, like a computer, contains programs. Hofstede (1984) calls the brain's program a mental program, which determines the human behaviour in various situations. According to this scholar, the mental program comprises individual, collective, and universal mental program.

The individual mental program is the result of the programming of the traits specific to a certain individual. These traits are passed on genetically through the genes specific to the corresponding family. The result of this programming can explain why an individual has the behavioural characteristics which are different from those of another individual from another different family.

The collective mental program is the result of the programming of the "environment" in which an individual is born into or in which he or she has grown up. This programming includes the instilling of cultural norms or values. It begins with the programming by the family and then is reinforced (and may be more or less modified) by playmates, schoolmates, fellow members of an organisation and, more importantly, by other members of the community, especially the members of the ethnic community in which the individual grows up. This collective mental program can explain why there are certain behaviours shared by members of the same ethnic community.

Finally, the universal mental program is the result of the programming of the "innate" characteristics of the humankind regardless of race, ethnicity, and individual identity. It applies universally and accounts for the fact that all human beings all over the world share common behaviours (such as laughing, crying).

This paper aims at attempting to get a picture of the collective speech act behaviour of the Javanese ethnics, in particular the linguistic behaviour in expressing the speech act of prohibiting, including their evaluation on each of the five strategies of its expression. In this regard, the Javanese community is viewed as constituting one system, a sociocultural one, in which despite differences in the behavioural pattern at the individual level, it is postulated that its members share common sociocultural identites. What binds them is, *inter alia*, the social principle of harmony cited earlier.

3.2 *Data Collection*

Data for this study were collected using a survey questionnaire developed on the basis of my intuition as a Javanese native speaker and on the results of interviews with nine Javanese experts, most of whom were faculty members of the Javanese Department, University of Indonesia. The questionnaire was tried out before use and to add to the internal validity of the data, the questionnaire was "triangulated" with interviews and observations. The results of the try-out and those of the interviews and observations showed a high degree of goodness of fit.

In the questionnaire respondents were first asked to provide information on their personal data anonymously, including whether or not they still speak Javanese fluently. Respondents were then asked to provide an act of prohibiting to a hypothetical interlocutor in each of the eight hypothetical situations differentiated on the basis of three pairs of variables, namely (1) ± power (Po), (2) ± solidarity (So) and (3) ± public (Pu).

The third parameter was an input of the resource persons, the majority of whom stated that the form of prohibiting is mostly influenced by the fact whether or not there is someone else present, within the hearing distance, in the corresponding speech event. Thus, +Pu means that there is at least one other person (except the addressor and the addressee) present in the uttering of the prohibition, while -Pu means there is no other person present.

By the same token, +Po means that the addressee is senior to the addressor in terms of rank, age, wealth, etc; -Po means the contrary: the addressee is not superior to the addressor.

The solidarity parameter refers to the social distance or "closeness" between the interlocutors. At the risk of oversimplification, solidarity in this study is defined in terms of the period of time (long or short) in which they have known each other.

Using the three pairs of parameter, eight hypothetical situations were arrived at, the summary of which is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Eight hypothetical situations of speech used in eliciting the speech act of prohibiting

No.	Situation	Code	Addressor	Relationship	Setting
1.	A	+Po -So -Pu	> Senior	Not close	Not public
2.	B	-Po -So -Pu	≤ Senior	Not close	Not public
3.	C	+Po +So -Pu	> Senior	Close	Not public
4.	D	-Po +So -Pu	≤ Senior	Close	Not public
5.	E	+Po -So +Pu	> Senior	Not close	Public
6.	F	-Po -So +Pu	≤ Senior	Not close	Public
7.	G	+Po +So +Pu	> Senior	Close	Public
8.	H	-Po +So +Pu	≤ Senior	Close	Public

Respondents were told that each of the eight situations took place in an airconditioned room in which someone is smoking or is about to smoke. The respondents were asked to imagine that they find it necessary, for various reasons, to ask that other person to refrain from smoking. First, the respondents were asked to answer whether or not they really asked the other person to stop smoking. In the event that they really did ask the other person not to (continue to) smoke, the respondents were then asked to write down the token of their prohibition in Indonesian. They were told that the intonation, tone, and stresses of their respective utterance were neutral.

In another part of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rate the relative degree of the appropriateness of the five strategies of prohibiting for each situation using a scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 means very inappropriate, 2 inappropriate, 3 of mid appropriateness, 4 appropriate and 5 very appropriate. In line with Brown and Levinson's theory, the five strategies are: prohibiting baldly, prohibiting using positive politeness, prohibiting using negative politeness, prohibiting in an off-record manner, and not prohibiting (in the sense that the addressor says nothing).

3.3 *Respondents*

A total of 400 copies of the survey questionnaire was distributed to native speakers of Javanese whose level of education is at least senior high school (either they had completed it or they were still studying). With the generous assistance of a number of field assistants, the questionnaire was distributed to respondents-to-be in Jakarta, Yogyakarta and Semarang. The assistants were asked not to distribute the questionnaire to speakers of East Javanese dialect, the assumption being that the linguistic behaviour of Eastern Javanese is rather different from that of Central or Yogyakarta Javanese. Nevertheless, nine of the Jakarta respondents turned out to be born and to have grown in East Java Province. Data from these nine respondents were included anyhow in consideration that only one of them was from Surabaya and Malang respectively, the rest being from Kediri and Madiun, the dialect being very much similar to the Central Javanese dialect.

Of the 187 copies of completed and returned questionnaire, 18 were sorted out because of errors in completing. Another 11 copies were also not included in the data processing because the corresponding respondents stated that they no longer spoke Javanese fluently. The criterion of

knowing how to speak Javanese fluently is considered important in this study although the tokens of utterance elicited are in Indonesian. This is because in this study it is posited that the underlying structures of the tokens of utterance rest on the respondents' pragmatic competence which, in turn, is part and parcel of the collective mental program mentioned earlier. This Javanese pragmatic competence is thus posited to determine the deep structures of the tokens of utterance, the surface structures of which can be in Javanese, Indonesian, or any other language mastered by the respondents.

With 19 copies of the returned questionnaires being sorted out, the number of the respondents included in this study was 158. Of this number, 80 respondents were residents of Jakarta and its vicinity, whereas 78 respondents residents of Yogyakarta or Semarang, Central Java. Of the 158 respondents, 74 were males and 84 females, 77 finished or were still studying at the senior high school, 26 completed a three-year post-high school academic program or earned a BA degree, 38 earned a stratum-one degree program, and 13 earned a Master's degree or higher. In terms of age, the breakdown of the respondents is as follows:

Table 2. The breakdown of the respondents by age brackets

No.	Age Bracket	Number
1.	≤ 20	22
2.	21 - 30	47
3.	31 - 40	44
4.	41 - 50	29
5.	51 - 60	15
6.	≥ 61	1

3.4 *Data Analysis*

All in all, 1237 tokens were elicited from the 158 respondents, including 409 non-performed "speech acts." The realised speech acts were then classified into two groups according to the (in)direction. The indirec ones were further classified in terms of the strategy type, namely whether it was on record with positive politeness, on record with negative politeness, or whether it was off record. The unit of analysis in this study was the directive of asking someone not (to continue) to smoke, and the rough guide for deciding whether or not the off-record strategy was whether the words *merokok* ('to smoke') and *jangan* ('don't') in the corresponding tokens.

To decide whether the strategy is one in which positive politeness or negative politeness is used, Brown and Levinson's summary of speech act strategies (1987: 102 & 131) was used. Thus, for example, if a reason is used in the directive, then the strategy used is positive politeness. By contrast, if an interrogative is used in the expression of the directive, or if an apology accompanies the directive, then the strategy used is negative politeness.

The occurrences of each strategy (including strategy ∅ -- acts not performed) in each of the eight situations were counted, and the frequency counts were converted into percentages.

The scores obtained from the respondents' rating of the appropriateness of each of the five strategies per each situation was processed and subjected to ANOVA and Duncan's Multiple Range Test. The former analysis yielded an F value which would indicate whether or not there was a (significant) difference among the age groupings. The latter would indicate which groups are significantly different in terms of the strategy used.

Not all five strategies were looked into in this study. On the assumption that the Javanese have a penchant for avoiding calling a spade a spade and for opting for remaining silent than offending people, the analysis was focused on the realisation of the bald-on-record strategy and that of strategy ∅. The rationale is that, other things being equal, these two strategies will reveal more clearly than the other three strategies the possibility of there being a cultural norm transformation.

4. **Findings**

4.1 *Forms of the Directive*

The forms of the directives elicited in this study vary, irrespective of the age variable. Contrary to the expectation, there are quite a few of bald-on-record prohibitions, as exemplified by the following. (All of these examples and the examples which follow are not edited and the English translations were done by retaining as far as possible the original syntax of the original tokens so as to give a picture of the (in)direction.)

(1) *Jangan ngrokok di sini.*
'Don't smoke here.'

(2) *Jangan merokok diruang ber-AC, dong.*
'Don't smoke in an air-conditioned room, okay?'

(3) *Jangan merokok disini ini ruang berAC.*
'Don't smoke here; this room is air-conditioned.'

(4) *mBok jangan merokok.*
'Don't smoke, okay?'

or with some mitigation -- by not mentioning the word *merokok* ('to smoke').

(5) *Jangan mengganggu orang lain.*
'Don't disturb other people.'

(6) *Jangan membuat orang lain terganggu.*
'Don't make other people disturbed.'

What may be worth mentioning is that the larger part of these bald-on-record prohibitions were found in situations D and H, each being -Po+So-Pu and -Po+So+Pu, in which the addressee is not senior to the addressor and their role relationship is close. An inference which can be drawn here is that this finding seems to imply that in performing a speech act, especially if it potentially threatens the face of the addressee, Javanese would consider who the addressee is and what their tenor is like. Whether or not the parameter of publicness is also taken into account, the frequencies of occurrence of this speech act type in those situations (i.e. situations D and H) do not show clearly, the difference being insignificant.

There was quite a few of the speech acts which can be interpreted as the realisation of the on-record-plus-positive-politeness strategies. However, all in all there were only six substrategies used *vis-à-vis* fifteen postulated by Brown and Levinson. Examples of the six substrategies used by the respondents are as follows:

(7) *Saya juga suka merokok. Tapi sebaiknya kita nggak merokok disini.*
'I also like smoking. But it would be better if we don't smoke here.'

(8) *Kita tidak boleh merokok di sini.*
'We should not smoke here.'

(9) *Tentunya Bapak tidak tahan tidak merokok, ya. Sehingga harus merokok.*
'Surely Bapak ('you') can't stand not smoking, right? Therefore you are compelled to smoke here.'

(10) *Sebaiknya tidak merokok, mas.*
'It would be better not to smoke, brother.'

(11) *Merokok itu kan tidak baik untuk kesehatan, apalagi disini.*
'Smoking is not good to health, moreover here.'

(12) *Lo, kok merokok di sini.*
'How come (you) smoke here?'

(13) *Barangkali Bapak sependapat dengan saya. Di ruangan AC tidak boleh merokok.*
'Maybe you agree with me. In an air-conditioned room smoking is not allowed.'

In (7) the positive politeness is expressed by resorting to what Brown and Levinson call *in-groupness*, here the addressor implies that he and the addressee belong to the same group, namely the group of people who like smoking. Similarly, the use of *kita* ('inclusive we') in the same token of utterance, and also in (8), can be interpreted as implying in-groupness. In (9), the positive politeness is expressed by paying attention to what Brown and Levinson refer to as the *want* of the addressee. This is reinforced by using the Indonesian word *harus*, which implies 'being compelled to.'

In (10) in-groupness is expressed by using the Javanese address term *mas*. This address form implies closeness, and is used when addressing other Javanese. Most probably, this term is used to show that the speaker, like the hearer, is of the same ethnicity, hence in-groupness. Somehow, the implied positive politeness in (10) is reinforced by the use of a hedge *sebaiknya* ('it would be better if ...'), making the utterance sound a little bit more polite.

In (11) the positive politeness is expressed by giving a reason (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 128). A variation of this substrategy is by asking for a reason, as in (12). In (11) the positive politeness conveyed by means of giving a reason is reinforced by communicating the message 'to the public,' that is without pinpointing the addressee in particular.

Utterance (13), like (7), consists of two moves. The positive politeness is embedded in the first move, namely by calling for agreement between the addressor and the addressee. The illocutionary force of prohibiting is mitigated by the use of a hedge, *barangkali* ('perhaps').

There are also instances of "speech acts" expressed by combining the positive politeness and negative politeness, thus adding to the degree of politeness, as exemplified by (14):

(14) *Wah, Bapak masih merokok seperti saya. Mungkin banyak orang yang tidak suka asap rokok. Bagaimana kalau kita merokok di luar, Pak?*

'My, Bapak (you) still smoke like me. Maybe there are many people who don't like the smoke from cigarettes. What if we smoke outside, Sir?'

The combination of the strategies as exemplified in (14) comprises (1) the use of the word of deference *Bapak* (literally 'Father' -- whom I respect as my own father) in the sense of *you*; (2) the implication of in-groupness from the phrase *seperti saya* ('like me'); (3) the use of a hedge *mungkin* ('maybe'); (4) the use of *kita* ('inclusive we'), which suggests in-groupness; and (5) the implication of inviting (instead of prohibiting) as can be inferred from the syntax and lexical items in the last move.

The greater part of the tokens of the speech acts elicited in this survey makes use of negative politeness. Most often, the word of apology *maaf* is used.

(15) *Maaf, dik, sebaiknya tidak merokok.*
'My apology, younger brother, it would be better not to smoke.'

(16) *Maaf Pak, mohon Bapak tidak merokok di sini.*
'Please apologise me, Sir, you are requested not to smoke here.'

(17) *Barangkali sebaiknya merokoknya nanti saja. Maaf ya.*
'Maybe it would be better to smoke later. My apology, okay?'

(18) *Maaf, merokoknya entar aja dech penuh asap nich dan ber-AC.*
'Please apologise me, would it be possible to smoke later? This room is full of smoke; it's air-conditioned.'

(19) *Berhubung ruang ber-AC tolong tidak merokok, maaf.*
'Because this room is air-conditioned, please help by not smoking; my apology.'

(20) *Maaf, Anda kan tau ruangan berac, jadi jangan merokok disini.*
'My apology, you know this room is air-conditioned; so, don't smoke here.'

As can be seen in those examples, except in (18) and (20), negative politeness is expressed by using a hedge, in addition to apologising. In (15) the hedge is *sebaiknya* ('it would be better if ...'), in (16) it is *mohon* ('request'), in (17) *barangkali* ('perhaps') and *sebaiknya*, and in (19) *tolong* ('help').

Example (20) sounds less polite than (15) to (19). This is because the phrase *Anda kan tau* ('You know, right?') sounds blaming; moreover, only one substrategy, i.e. the use of an apology, is used in (20), while more than one substrategy is used in the other tokens. In (18), in-group language (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 110) is used to connote in-groupness. This is the variety of Indonesian commonly used by young, urban Indonesians such as the intentionally misspelt words *dech* and *nich*.

The other substrategy used in expressing negative politeness found in the data corpus is by formulating the prohibition in the form of a question, as exemplified by the following:

(21) *Sdr harus merokok di sini?*
'Must you smoke here?'

(22) *Masak merokok di ruangan ber-AC?*
'How come smoking in an air-conditioned room?'

(23) *Mengapa tidak merokok nanti saja? Ruangan ini ber-AC.*
'Why not smoke later? This room is air-conditioned.'

(24) *Bapak keberatan merokok di luar?*
'Do you mind smoking outside?'

(25) *Bapak mau merokok? Wah, kok tidak ada asbaknya, ya? Mungkin karena ini Ruang ber-AC. Bagaimana kalau kita merokok di luar?*
'Are you going to smoke? My, how come there is no ashtray? Maybe it's because this room is air-conditioned. What if we smoke outside?'

As can be seen, the degrees of politeness go up from (21) to (25). In (21) the politeness is expressed only by formulating the prohibition in the form of a question. In (22) the same illocutionary force is expressed in the form of a question implying a request for consideration. In (23), in addition to formulating the prohibition in the form of a question, the implication of added politeness is achieved by using the question word *mengapa* ('why'), which suggests that the speaker requests for an explanation (thus making use of the positive politeness strategy), as well as by giving the reason ('This room is air-conditioned').

In (24) the added politeness is expressed by using a term of address showing deference i.e. *Bapak*. As alluded to earlier, this word literally means 'father', but in this regard it is used in place of *you*. The extra politeness is also expressed, other things being equal, by using the word *keberatan* ('mind' or 'object to'), which suggests that the speaker gives the hearer an option. Token (24) can thus be paraphrased to read 'Please smoke outside, but if you object to, feel free to (continue to) smoke here.'

The extra politeness of (25) is achieved by (1) using the 'deferential you' *Bapak*, as in (24); (2) giving two reasons (instead of one as in (24); (3) using the hedge *mungkin* ('maybe'); and (4) using a word which implies in-groupness, i.e. *kita* (*inclusive 'we'*).

The effect of a deferential politeness in other instances is not only achieved through the use of a deferential term of address such as *Bapak* or its shortened form *Pak* as in the instances above. Other words showing respect are also used, as exemplified by the following:

(26) *Dengan hormat, terima kasih jika saudara tidak merokok diruang AC ini.*
'With due respect, thank you for not smoking in this air-conditioned room.'

(27) *Mohon izin, ada tulisan dilarang merokok, pak.*
'I'd like to request for your permission, (but) there is a no-smoking sign, Sir.'

(28) *Bukannya saya anti perokok, tapi mohon harap untuk tidak merokok di ruangan ini, demi kesehatan.*
'It's not that I am against smokers, but I'd like to request you not to (please) smoke in this room, for the sake of health.'

(29) *Mohon bapak berkenan untuk tidak merokok. Ruangan ini ber-AC.*
'I'd like to request that you, if you please, don't smoke. This room is air-conditioned.'

(30) *Kami mohon Bapak tidak ngunjuk rokok di sini.*
'We (exclusive) request that you don't smoke (*honorifics*) here.'

In spite of the glare grammatical mistakes, especially in (26) and (28), the instances above show that the use of words or phrases showing respect as devices of politeness is common among Javanese. In (26), the expression of deference is explicit, albeit unusual, namely by the use of *dengan hormat* ('with (due) respect'). In this token, added politeness is achieved by thanking the addressee (*terima kasih*), which implies that the addressor is indebted to the addressee -- one substrategy for conveying negative politeness according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 110). This is further added by the use of a l.e ge in the form of an if-clause ... *jika Saudara tidak merokok* ('if you don't smoke').

Example (27) seems to have been written by a respondent who was a member of the Indonesian Armed Forces or at least a person who was familiar with the 'rules of speaking' among members of the Indonesian Military. One of the rules is for the subordinate to show respect to those higher in rank and to say *mohon izin* ('requesting a permission') before saying something.

In (28), deference is shown by using *mohon harap* ('requesting, if you please'), which is redundant, and in (29) by using *berkenaan* ('if you will'). In (30), deference is expressed by using a Javanese honorific *ngunjuk* ('to drink'), not an uncommon strategy among Javanese who believe, wrongly, that Indonesian words cannot express deference adequately and that therefore Javanese honorifics should be used even in Indonesian discourse.

Found in the data corpus are tokens in which the substrategy of expressing negative politeness by giving the addressee an option is used. This is the substrategy which calls for the use

of *if*, which in Indonesian can be *kalau*, *jika*, *bila* or *andaikata*). These can be construed as hedges, alleviating the illocutionary force:

(31) *Kalau bisa, jangan merokok dong. Asapnya mengganggu.*
'If possible, don't smoke, okay? The smoke is disturbing.'

(32) *Jika tidak keberatan, harap tidak merokok.*
'If you don't mind, I hope you don't smoke.'

(33) *Bila Bapak tidak keberatan, maaf barangkali merokoknya diluar saja. Ini ruang tertutup.*
'If you don't mind, my apology, perhaps your smoking should be outside. This is a closed room.'

(34) *Jika merokoknya di luar, bagaimana ya?*
'If the smoking is done outside, how about it?'

(35) *Andai tidak merokok, bagaimana?*
'If you didn't smoke, how would it be?'

Instances using the off-record strategy turn out to have a high frequency of occurrence in the corpus. For practical purposes, these off-record tokens are here classified into strong hints and mild hints. Examples of the former are as follows:

(36) *Perokok pasip bisa lebih menderita.*
'Passive smokers can suffer more.'

(37) *Bagi perokok berat memang susah, tapi bagaimana ya?*
'For a heavy smoker it is indeed difficult (not to smoke), but what should be done?'

(38) *Wah, asapnya*
'My, the smoke.'

(39) *Akibat asap napas menjadi sesak.*
'Because of the smoke, breathing is difficult.'

(40) *Asapnya menyebabkan polusi.*
'The smoke causes pollution.'

It is worth noting that instances of the off-record tokens were found in all eight situations, but that a high frequency is found in situations in which the addressee is superior to the addressor and the relationship is not close.

Token (36) is grouped under the strong hint because the message conveyed by the speaker is strong, the word *perokok* ('smoker') being used, which would be quickly associated, it is assumed, by the addressee with the word *merokok* ('to smoke'). Somehow, the strength of the illocutionary force was mitigated by the use of the words *bisa* and *lebih*, hedges of a sort. Without

hedging, the token would read as *Perokok pasip menderita* ('Passive smokers suffer'), for which the illocutionary path would be more straight than that of the hedged one.

In (37), the hint conveyed by the speaker is also sufficiently strong, but two politeness substrategies are used here to protect the face of the hearer. One substrategy is by using a positive politeness substrategy, which is expressed by showing sympathy ('I know that it is difficult for a heavy smoker to refrain from smoking ...'). The second substrategy is by asking a question, which according to Brown and Levinson can be construed as a substrategy of *be conventionally indirect*.

In (38), (39) and (40), the relative strength of the hint is expressed by using the word *asap* ('smoke'), which, under the prevailing context, is readily associated with smoking. In (38) the implicature of the prohibition is not so clear as that in (39) in that in the former it is explicitly stated that it is disturbing. The prohibiting force in (40) is stronger than that in (39) because in the former the implication conveyed is worse than that in the latter.

Instances of mild hints, which can be inferred from the more curving illocutionary path (i.e. the line which connects the point of departure of the illocution and its point of destination), are exemplified by the following:

(41) *Kayaknya ruang ini berAC, ya?*
'It looks like this room is air-conditoned, right?'

(42) *Hm, rupanya bapak ini tidak sependapat dengan teknologi AC.*
'Uhm, it seems you don't appreciate air-conditioning technology.'

(43) *Mari menjaga kesehatan, Pak. Ini ruang berAC.*
'Let's maintain health, Sir. This room is air-conditioned.'

(44) *Rupanya saudara tidak ingin panjang umur.*
'It seems that you don't want to live long.'

(45) *Wah, batuk saya kumat.*
'My, I have relapse of my cough.'

(46) *Monggo, di ruang sebelah banyak jendela terbuka.*
'If you please (*in Javanese*), many of the windows in the adjoining room are open.'

As can be seen, there are no words which are readily associated with smoking in the examples above. The association with smoking in (41) through (46) is remote or, in other words, these tokens of speech act violate the Gricean maxim of relation. The implicature of prohibition 'don't smoke' can only be appreciated by relating the tokens to their contexts. In some contexts an unwanted force of the tokens above, i.e. that of sarcasm, can even be perceived.

The fifth strategy, i.e. the strategy of not performing the act (strategy ∅), can only be described in terms of its occurences. All in all, there were 409 instances of not performing the act in the eight hypothetical situations. The breakdown of these instances is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The frequency of occurrence
of the instances of not performing the act of prohibiting
in eight hypothetical situations

No.	Situation	Code	f	%
1.	A	+Po -So -Pu	77	18.8
2.	B	-Po -So -Pu	41	10.1
3.	C	+Po +So -Pu	54	13.2
4.	D	-Po +So -Pu	27	6.6
5.	E	+Po -So +Pu	79	19.3
6.	F	-Po -So +Pu	29	7.1
7.	G	+Po +So +Pu	65	15.8
8.	H	-Po +So +Pu	37	9.1
		Total	**409**	**100**

4.2 *Frequencies of Occurrence*

In terms of Brown and Levinson's five strategies, the occurences of the realisation of each strategy are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Occurrences of each of the five strategies of prohibiting
by all respondents (N=187) in all eight hypothetical situations

No.	Strategy	f	%
1.	Bald on record	243	19.6
2.	On record + positive politeness	163	13.2
3.	On record + negative politeness	147	11.8
4.	Off record	275	22.2
5.	∅	409	33.1
	Total	**1237**	**100**

The relatively small percentage of the bald-on-record strategy can be interpreted as suggesting that, as a whole, the respondents prefer using the other four strategies. This may be indicative that by and large the Javanese still adhere to the principle of harmony cited above and, by implication, to the four maxims posited. This seems to be corroborated by the high incidence of the realisation of the strategy of not prohibiting. With 409 instances (33.1%), the highest, this can be interpreted that the majority of the respondents (and Javanese in general, by implication) would prefer saying nothing to disrupting social harmony.

It may be pertinent to see the high incidence of the strategy of not performing the act in terms of age grouping (interval=10 years). Table 5 shows the breakdown of the realisation of this strategy in terms of the age-bracket variable.

Table 5. Occurrences of the bald-on-record prohibition
by age grouping

No.	Age Group	f	%
1.	≤ 20 (N=22)	58	13.9
2.	21 - 30 (N=47)	77	31.7
3.	31 - 40 (N=40)	42	17.2
4.	41 - 50 (N=29)	32	13.2
5.	≥ 51 (N=16)*	34	13.9
Total		**243**	**100**

*) One respondent in the 61-70 age bracket was included in the ≥ 51 bracket.

The percentages in Table 4 do not show an implicational scale and therefore no inference can be drawn that the use of strategy ∅ covaries with age. However, if we group the respondents into two generations, i.e. the generation of 30 years or younger and the generation of over 30 years old, we have the following figures:

≤ 30 years old: 55.6% (23.9% + 31.7%)

> 30 years old: 44.3% (17.2% + 13.2% + 13.9%)

These figures suggest that respondents belonging to the younger generation (and by implication Javanese of the younger generation) are "bolder" in using the bald-on-record strategy than those of the older generation. If this interpretation is correct, perhaps it indicates that the norm of the linguistic behaviour of Javanese is shifting: younger Javanese tend to be more straightforward than the older ones.

The tally of the instances of the realisation of strategy ∅ in the data corpus yields percentages presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Occurrences of the ∅ prohibition
by age groups

No.	Age Group	f	%
1.	≤ 20 (N=22)	34	8.3
2.	21 - 30 (N=47)	63	15.4
3.	31 - 40 (N=40)	109	26.6
4.	41 - 50 (N=29)	123	30.1
5.	≥ 51 (N=16)	80	19.5
Total		**409**	**100**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The percentages in the five cells in Table 5 conform to an almost perfect scalability. With one aberration, i.e. the percentage for the ≥ 51 years old, the scalability is 80% (one aberration in a five-cell scale). An inference which can be drawn from this implicational scale is that the younger the respondents, the stronger the implication that fewer instances of ∅ prohibitions would be used. If this interpretation is correct, it may indicate that the younger respondents are "bolder" than the older ones and that, by implication, younger Javanese are "braver" in speaking their minds than the older ones.

4.3 *Strategy Appropriateness*

As mentioned earlier, one section of the survey questionnaire asks the respondents to rate the degree of the appropriateness of Brown and Levinson's five strategies in each of the eight hypothetical situations, using a five-point scale.

It may be worth noting that many respondents gave a score of 4 as the highest rating, and quite a few of them even gave a score of 3 as the highest. On the basis of the samples of the speech acts presented in point 4.1, it may be hypothesised that the tendency of not giving the score of 4 or 5 is due to the fact that only one strategy of performing a speech act does not conform to the Javanese standard of politeness: in order to be really polite, a combination of strategies need to be used. Negative politeness need to be complemented with positive politeness, and vice versa, in order for a speech act to be given a rating of 4 or 5.

The appropriateness quantified data elicited by means of the questionnaire were subjected to statistical analyses against four variables, namely sex, education level, residence (Jakarta or otherwise) and age group. The summary of the results of the analysis of variance of the bald-on-record data in Situation E is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of the results
of the ANOVA of the bald-on-record data obtained
in Situation E (+Po-So+Pu) from 158 respondents (α=0.05)

No.	Variable	F Value	Remarks
1.	Sex	0.14	Not significant
2.	Education	5.03	Significant
3.	Residence	7.85	Significant
4.	Age Group	1.05	Not significant

The inference which can be drawn from Table 6 is that only education and residence (Jakarta or Semarang/Yogyakarta) make a significant difference in the realisation of the bald-on-record strategy. The F value of the education variable seems to indicate that there is a tendency for more highly educated Javanese to rate this strategy as more appropriate than less highly educated Javanese.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For the residence variable, Duncan's grouping yields a mean score of 1.615 for Jakarta respondents and 1.228 for non-Jakarta (i.e. Semarang and Yogyakarta) residents. These mean scores suggest that, other things being equal, the bald-on-record strategy is considered inappropriate by the Jakarta respondents (and by implication by Jakarta Javanese by and large) and is considered *very* inappropriate by non-Jakarta respondents (and by extension non-Jakarta Javanese in general). Subject to verification, this finding seems to indicate that Jakarta Javanese (possibly being more exposed to non-Javanese values of the other ethnics) are shifting from traditional Javanese values.

What is important to note in the summary of the results of the ANOVA is that age group does not covary with the realisation of the bald-on-record strategy. Duncan's Multiple Range Test corroborates this, as can be seen in the following printout of the result of test.

Source	DF	Anova SS	F Value	Pr > F
Age	5	4.09039798	1.05	0.3932

SITUATION E
Analysis of Variance Procedure
Duncan's Multiple Range Test for variable: CARA 1
α=0.05 df=151 MSE=0.782546
Harmonic Mean of cell sizes=5.019367

Number of Means	2	3	4	5	6
Critical Range	1.109	1.166	1.203	1.231	1.254

Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

Duncan Grouping	Mean	N	Age
A	1.636	22	≤ 20
A			
A	1.553	47	21 - 30
A			
A	1.386	44	31 - 40
A			
A	1.241	29	41 - 50
A			
A	1.143	14	51 - 60
A			
A	1.000	1	61 - 70

However, what should not be left uninterpreted is the mean scores in the printout, which, as can be seen, conform to a *perfect* scalability, corresponding to the increase in age. As can be seen, the mean scores decrease as the age group increases, suggesting that the bald-on-record strategy is most appropriate among the ≤20 years old, becoming less and less appropriate as the age group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

becomes higher and higher. Even if the one respondent in the 61-70 age bracket is sorted out, the general tendency remains: the score of appropriateness of this strategy changes (i.e. becomes lower) *consistently* from one age bracket to a higher one. An inference, albeit weak, which can be drawn at this juncture is that the perception of the appropriateness of the bald-on-record strategy covaries with the age gradience.

To see whether there is some evidence which would corroborate that inference, Duncan's Multiple Range Test as regards the realisation of the bald-on-record strategy in *all* situations in terms of age group was applied. All of the scores of appropriateness are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Scores of appropriateness of the bald-on-record strategy yielded by Duncan's multiple range test of the data obtained from 158 respondents for all eight hypothetical situations by age group

No.	Age Group	Situation							
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1.	≤ 20	2.091	2.545	2.273	*3.409	1.636	2.106	2.318	3.000
2.	21 - 30	1.638	2.043	2.213	3.447	1.553	2.045	1.894	2.787
3.	31 - 40	1.545	1.932	1.795	-2.455	1.386	1.795	1.795	2.276
4.	41 - 50	1.483	*2.414	1.724	3.034	1.241	1.759	1.414	2.182
5.	51 - 60	1.286	1.857	1.467	2.533	1.143	*1.929	*1.533	*2.333
6.	61 - 70	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)	(1.000)

*=aberration

Lest it should be biased, the scores for the one-respondent 61-70 age group can be omitted (there being only one respondent). Yet, the remaining figures in Table 7 still show the fairly strong general tendency that the higher the age group, the lower the score of appropriateness of the use of the bald-on-record strategy. With 40 cells and 6 aberrations (marked with an asterisk), the figures in Table 7 form an implicational scale of 85%, and thus the general tendency can be construed as reliable -- subject to verification, needless to say.

Just an additional inference, each figure under column A, B, C, D, F, G and H is, row by row, *consistently* bigger than each of the figures under column E (which is +Po-So+Pu). Two deductions can be made pursuant to this. First, it shows that figures in the table are not chance or random figures. Hence, an inference can be drawn that the respondents were serious and honest in assigning their scores. Second, it shows that the rationale for using Situation E as a yardstick for "measuring the boldness" of expressing a prohibition is not incorrect.

5. Concluding Remarks

One of the objectives of the research study is to seek clues whether the Javanese value system is shifting. If this objective sounds like a tall order, then it should be mitigated to finding some empirical evidence whether Javanese cultural norms are undergoing transformation.

The norm-transformation hypothesis is here looked into by using age gradation as a variable. The findings show that there is an indication, albeit weak, that the Javanese norms of

speaking are changing. Younger Javanese tend to be more "straightforward" than older Javanese in expressing a directive of prohibiting.

That no hard-and-fast evidence has been detected may be due to the fact that only one speech act, i.e. the act of prohibiting, was used as the unit of analysis. The realisation of more speech acts should be studied in order to yield stronger evidence that the Javanese cultural norms of speaking are indeed changing.

References

Brown, Penelope and S.C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Geertz, Hildred. 1961. *The Javanese Family: A Study of Kinship and Socialisation.* New York: The Free Press

Gunarwan, Asim. 1996a. The speech act of criticizing among speakers of Javanese. Paper presented at the Sixth Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society. Eugene, Oregon, May 10-12

Gunarwan, Asim. 1996b. Language and language variety as metaphors: evidence from the east Javanese folk theater. Paper presented at the Fifth International Pragmatics Conference. Mexico City, July 4-9

Hofstede, Geert. 1984. *Culture's Consequences.* London: Sage

Leech, Geoffrey. 1982. *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman

Magnis-Suseno, Franz. 1984. *Etika Jawa* (Javanese Ethics). Jakarta: PT Gramedia